

next 5 to 7 years, about \$1.2 trillion and if you add the tax cuts that the Republicans are proposing, that adds another \$200 billion or so. And if you add the defense billions of dollars in military increases, that adds another \$100 billion.

You end up with \$1.5 trillion deficit that you have to make up in about 7 years. And I take a look at that and find that they are saying they want to balance the budget and I take a look at where they are cutting now. It makes it clear to me what they are going to do to try to balance this budget, on whose backs they are going to do it, and it scares me.

And I offer my colleagues the final chance to speak.

Mr. SANDERS. I just want to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA]. I think this is an enormously important discussion dealing with what the priorities of America should be. And I thank you very much for leading this discussion.

Mr. BECERRA. The gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT. I want to thank the gentleman from California. This is an excellent presentation. We have choices to make and we have to look at our priorities and the quality of life and what we are doing here as legislators. And I thank you for giving us the opportunity to bring these facts forward.

Mr. ANDREWS. I join in thanking my friend from California. We are all equal Members of the People's House. We may disagree over what our priorities shall be, but we should never disagree over our right to debate those priorities.

The majority is about to deny us that right unless we defeat the rule that comes before us on Tuesday night.

Mr. BECERRA. I would say that the majority is not just denying the four of us, the majority of this House is now denying the American people the chance to express itself and that must change.

I thank all of my colleagues for being here.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, as the ranking member of the Committee on Veterans Affairs, I rise to urge all my colleagues to support an amendment to the rescission bill reported last Thursday by the Appropriations Committee. The amendment is modest in scope but vital to VA health care. It would restore the \$206 million for veterans programs which the Committee on Appropriations proposes to rescind.

These rescissions don't make good sense. These funds were appropriated by Congress only a few months ago, primarily to help meet a critical need to improve veterans' access to outpatient care. The six VA projects which the committee now proposes to cancel would serve areas where more than 1.2 million veterans reside.

The budget for construction of veterans medical facilities has been pretty lean for the past 5 or 6 years. As a result, the VA says it now has almost 60 projects to improve outpatient services waiting to be funded. The VA could award construction contracts on these

six projects in the next several months. We shouldn't put these projects off 1 day.

These are projects that can make VA health care delivery more cost-effective. This rescission bill would slam the door on veterans across this country. In some parts of the country, the VA doesn't have health facilities that meet veterans needs. In other places, the clinics are just too small. At one clinic, space is so tight that doctors are forced to perform eye examinations in the hallways. Veterans deserve better than this.

An increasing number of veterans are women; over 1.2 million. Many VA outpatient clinics still lack privacy for women veterans. In the face of such conditions, the rescission bill is a giant step backward.

Likewise, cutting funds for replacement equipment—as proposed by the rescission measure—forces VA to choose between obtaining a needed service at increased cost through contracting or continuing to use inefficient or even obsolete equipment. The VA's medical equipment backlog is more than \$800 million. We must assure that VA care is care of high quality. Cutting back on VA funds to replace old equipment is putting our veterans at risk.

I want to commend all of the Members who are working hard to restore these funds—the gentlewomen from Florida, Ms. BROWN and Mrs. THURMAN, the gentlewoman from Connecticut, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ and the other Members who are gathered here tonight. They are all doing a good job looking out for our Nation's veterans.

#### GETTING OUR FINANCIAL HOUSE IN ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LONGLEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] is recognized for 30 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for the dialogue they had. This is going to be a long process and hopefully when we are done we will find some common ground.

Mr. Speaker, I am speaking tonight on an issue that to me is extraordinarily important and that is getting our financial House in order. And I think in terms of this, what I have looked at as I have served now in Congress for 7 years and have been a State legislator 13 years before, I see a society where we have 12-year-olds having babies; a society where we have 14-year-olds selling drugs and 15-year-olds killing each other; a society where our 18-year-olds who have diplomas cannot even read their diplomas. I see a society where we have 25-year-olds who have never worked and 30-year-olds who are grandparents.

That is a society I see in our country, and I believe a society like that cannot long endure.

I also am seeing a society where we have had for the last 20 years extraordinarily large budget deficits. We have seen the national debt go up and up and up, our annual deficits adding to the national debt each year.

And I do not single out any one party. We all shared in that to the extent that we were a part of it. I would like to think that I was a force for restraint in this, but we had Republicans who did not want to cut defense and we had Democrats who did not want to control the growth of entitlements.

And Gramm-Rudman only focused in on what we called discretionary spending. It never dealt with entitlements. What we had was a Republican President, and now a Democratic President, who are willing to have the status quo continue.

And I have often been asked what do I think about a balanced budget amendment. I think it would be great if we did not need it. And we do not need it if we have a President who submits a balanced budget, be he a Republican or Democrat. We would not need it if we had a Congress that decided to reject unbalanced budgets. And we would not need it if we had a President, who was receiving a budget that was not balanced, that would simply decide to veto it.

But that has not been the case and that is why I have become convinced that the only way we are going to see some sanity to what we have is to require a balanced budget amendment. The White House to submit a balanced budget and Congress to vote out a budget that is, in fact, balanced.

I thought long and hard about how much have I, as a Member of Congress, or in the State House, been a part of the solution and a part of the problem. And when I was elected 7 years ago, I was determined that I could look my family in the eye and my constituents, go to a town meeting and say, I have voted to control the growth in spending. I have voted to get our financial house in order.

I am finally going to see the opportunity to have that come to fruition in a real way. When I first started out, there were about 30 of us who were voting to control the growth in spending. That number grew to about 60. It then got to be about 80, including Republicans and some Democrats. And then there were times that we were up to about 160 during the last session.

In fact, during the Penny-Kasich debate, when Republicans and Democrats, 15 Republicans, 15 Democrats, got together, led by Mr. KASICH and Mr. Penny, the Democrat, Mr. KASICH the Republican, and we put together a package of \$90 billion of cuts in spending.

And I went to the White House and spoke to Leon Panetta and asked him to support this proposal and I said, "If you cannot support it, at least do not oppose it." I received my answer a week after my visit when the White House decided to oppose, for the very first time in Congress, a bipartisan effort to control spending.

I will tell you that was probably one of the most disheartening things that has happened, because I thought you want to nurture that. You want, if you

have Republicans and Democrats who are willing to cut spending in Congress, no less, you want to nurture that. But it was not nurtured. It was an attempt to stamp it out. The vote failed by just four votes.

So I guess I could take some real satisfaction we came so close. And how encouraging that would have been to have seen that bipartisan effort succeed. It did not succeed and our deficits continue and Congress still is wrestling with how we get our financial house in order.

I often think about whether we are a caretaking society or a caring society. And I describe it this way: a caretaking society is a society that tries to take care of people, and then those who vote for the bills that take care of people feel good that they have voted for something that takes care of someone, without asking what are they actually doing.

To me, the preferable one is the caring society. The caretaking society gives the food; the caring society shows someone how to grow the seed so it becomes food and feeds them until they get to that point.

Now, the stereotype I have of a liberal is an individual who sees someone drowning 50 feet out and runs to the end of the pier and grabs 100 feet of rope and throws that rope out to the person who is drowning 50 feet out.

□ 2300

The person who is drowning is trying to grab onto the rope and make it taut, ready to be pulled in. The stereotype liberal, when the line is taut, drops the line and says, "I have done my good deed. Now on to the next good deed."

I have just as discomfoting a view of the stereotyped conservative who sees someone drowning 50 feet out, grabs 25 feet of line, throws it to the individual, it does not quite reach him, and says, "You swim halfway, and I will do my part and I will pull you in."

I have to feel that somewhere between that stereotype of the liberal and the stereotype of the conservative is a sensible program that tries to reach out to the person who is drowning, takes the temporary step of pulling them in, throwing them enough line to work, making sure the program works, not walking on to the next program, pulls the individual in, and then just does not part company, but teaches that person how to swim.

Mr. Speaker, what I wrestle with is the fact that as I look at this budget chart, and the task that I have as a member of the Committee on the Budget, what is in the dark green is basically what we call entitlements; Social Security. Entitlement is not a bad word, it means someone is truly entitled. It has gotten to mean something that is not always positive, but someone who has paid into Social Security is entitled because they put money into a system and expect to receive it back in retirement.

In the shades of different green there is Medicare, that is 10 percent of the budget; there is Medicaid, which is 5.7. Then there are other entitlements that are 121.3 percent. These entitlements add up to 50 percent of the budget. They are on automatic pilot.

I have been here since 1987, and I rarely get an opportunity to vote on these, because they are in the law, and if the law is not changed, they just keep happening. The numbers keep growing, and the costs keep growing. They begin to consume more and more of our Federal budget.

No one, Mr. Speaker, Republican and Democrat, has yet to truly address entitlements. We also have something else that is on automatic pilot for the most part. It is in yellow, and it is interest in the national debt.

Collectively, entitlements, 49 percent of our budget; interest on the national debt, 15 percent of our budget—and by the way, interest on the national debt is \$234 billion—two-thirds of our budget are on automatic pilot.

What do I vote on? I get to vote on 36 percent, which is in the 3 tones of pink, domestic discretionary spending. It funds the judicial, legislative, executive branch, all the departments of the executive branch, all the grants of the executive branch, minus the Defense Department.

The Defense Department is so large that we just isolate it as a similar expenditure. It is almost identical, it is 1 percent more than discretionary domestic spending. Defense is 1 percent more. Then we have what we call international, about 1.4 percent. That is the State Department and foreign aid.

I vote, when I get the Committee on Appropriations expenditure bill, I vote on one-third of this entire pie. Two-thirds has been on automatic pilot, and growing.

Mr. Speaker, what do we need to do? We need to take an honest look at what we can control. Democrats and Republicans, candidly, have done a pretty good job of trying to control the growth in discretionary spending, both defense and nondefense. You see a good example of it right here.

You see the growth in spending for each of the next, from 1995 to the year 2000, and you see the annual growth. What was in the solid greens, the entitlements, different shades, they are growing at extraordinary rates: Social Security, 5.2; Medicare, 9.6; Medicaid, 9.1. The numbers we have from CBO, Congressional Budget Office, are higher, but I used the President's own numbers. Other entitlements are at 6.1 percent.

What is happening is interest on the national debt is going up nearly 6 percent. The entitlements are growing, they are 50 percent of the budget. They are on automatic pilot. What I vote on, defense spending, will go down three-tenths, will go down less than a percent, three-tenths of 1 percent. Foreign aid and the State Department will go down about 1.9 percent during each of

the next 5 years. Domestic spending is only going to go up a tenth of 1 percent.

So what I vote on, what we debate, the discretionary spending out of Committee on Appropriations is basically, for the next 5 years, at a standstill. This is what we have to address. We have to address the extraordinary growth of Medicare and Medicaid.

Mr. Speaker, there was discussion earlier on about the food and nutrition program. I will use this as an example of what makes the debate difficult. What makes the debate difficult is that people simply are not leveling with the American people about what is truly happening. We may disagree with the WIC Program and the School Lunch Program as proposed by the Republicans, but we know that the School Lunch Program is going to go up at 4.5 percent during each of the next 5 years. This is in the solid blue. The black is the number that it would grow without our program. It would be slightly more expensive, ever so slightly. You probably cannot even see it.

The program devised by the Republicans will allow spending on the School Lunch Program to go up 4.5 percent during each of the next 5 years. The WIC Program is seen in the red. It also will continue to grow at that basic rate of over 4 percent a year. We can call it a cut in spending, yes, I guess you could call it that. It would not be accurate, but you could call it.

What you can call it is a growth in spending, a significant growth in spending of 4.5 percent as it relates to the School Lunch Program.

The problem we have in Washington is, and I did not have it when I was in the State House, we could never get away with it in the State House, but when I came down here I would always hear how we were cutting spending, yet I was finding that spending was continuing to grow. I could not figure out how we could call it a cut in spending if it was continuing to grow.

Then I learned after just watching this process for a while that if a program cost \$100 million to run this year, and \$105 next year, and we appropriate \$103 million, Washington, the White House, Congress, both parties, have historically, and the press, have historically called it a \$2 million cut in spending. Even though it went from \$100 to \$103 million, they are going to call it a \$2 million cut in spending, because they said it should have gone up to \$105. What most people would call it is a \$3 million increase in spending.

We are not going to succeed in balancing our budget unless we are able to get a handle on the entitlement spending that is on automatic pilot and slow the growth.

What we anticipate by the year 2002 is that spending, without our taking any action, will grow over \$3 trillion of new money. We want to bring that down to a level of growth of about \$1.9 trillion, almost \$2 trillion. We want it

to grow, we just do not want it to grow as quickly.

The reason we want it not to grow as quickly is we want to eliminate the deficits. We want to make the interest of what we pay on the national debt smaller. I think of the generations that have preceded me in Congress, the Members that preceded and voted out these large deficits, and those that were here while I was here who continue to vote out large deficits.

We now spend \$234 billion on interest on the national debt. Think of what we could do with that money if it was not interest on the national debt. Think of the programs that we could do, that would be meaningful.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think we are going to succeed in slowing the growth of Medicare and Medicaid unless it is bipartisan. I'm not sure how that is going to happen, because the dialog to date has not been encouraging. We have not had the President come in with a recommendation on how he would suggest we slow the growth in spending; still spend more, just not spend as much.

We are having a dialog now where Republicans are saying we need to take tough stands on some of these programs, tough; we are going to allow the nutrition program to go up 4.5 percent, instead of 5.2 percent. I guess we could call it tough. I think it makes sense.

I think it makes sense to block grant the program. I think it makes sense to spend more of the money on the poor children in our school districts. I had some of the school nutrition people come to my office and tell me they did not want that to happen, they want to subsidize lunch for all students. I said "I want it to go to the students who cannot pay for it."

They said "We do not want two lines in our school system, the poorer kids, and the kids who can afford that." I said "Do not have two lines, have one line, but give one of the students a voucher, a coin, something that enables him to have a subsidized lunch."

So as I think about this debate, and wonder if we are going to continue the way we are going, or whether we are going to have change, I am encouraged. I think that there are a number of Republicans who are willing to take some tough votes and take responsible votes. I think there are going to be a number of Democrats who will as well. I think we are going to have an honest debate about what was discussed earlier about taxes. To me, deficit reduction comes before cutting taxes.

I might have a disagreement as to what the tax cuts do. I happen to think a capital gains cut makes sense. I happen to think that what we need to worry about is what happens to the money once it is provided to that taxpayer, what do they do with it.

If we can provide tax cuts where a person takes the money and invests it in new plant and equipment and increases productivity, and it means more jobs for Americans, I think it

makes sense. If it means that it is not going to encourage growth, then I have a question mark.

□ 2310

The jury is still out as to what is going to happen to the tax cuts. They will be funded. I think they will pass, but ultimately what the Senate will do for me, I am going to vote to control the growth in spending. I am going to allow my Government to spend more money on these very needed programs. I am just going to have the growth be more sensible and not so out of control. And I am going to vote to make rational controls as well to some of the discretionary spending that we see.

We need to slow the growth in spending. We are going to spend more, we are just not going to spend as much as we have been spending.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank you and the staff who are here staying up late to allow us to share our views on what we think are some very important issues.

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING FOR THE 104TH CONGRESS

(Mr. THOMAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to and in accordance with clause 2 (a) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives and clause B of rule I of the Rules of the Joint Committee on Printing, I submit for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of the rules of the Joint Committee on Printing for the 104th Congress as approved by the Committee on March 6, 1995.

#### JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

##### RULE 1—COMMITTEE RULES

(a) The rules of the Senate and House insofar as they are applicable, shall govern the Committee.

(b) The Committee's rules shall be published in the Congressional Record as soon as possible following the Committee's organizational meeting in each odd-numbered year.

(c) Where these rules require a vote of the members of the Committee, polling of members either in writing or by telephone shall not be permitted to substitute for a vote taken at a Committee meeting, unless the ranking minority member assents to waiver of this requirement.

(d) Proposals for amending Committee rules shall be sent to all members at least one week before final action is taken thereon, unless the amendment is made by unanimous consent.

##### RULE 2—REGULAR COMMITTEE MEETINGS

(a) The regular meeting date of the Committee shall be the second Wednesday of every month when the House and Senate are in session. A regularly scheduled meeting need not be held if there is no business to be considered and after appropriate notification is made to the ranking minority member. Additional meetings may be called by the chairman as he may deem necessary or at the request of the majority of the members of the Committee.

(b) If the chairman of the Committee is not present at any meeting of the Committee, the vice-chairman or ranking member of the majority party on the Committee who is present shall preside at the meeting.

##### RULE 3—QUORUM

(a) Five members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum which is required for the purpose of closing meetings, promulgating Committee orders or changing the rules of the Committee.

(b) Three members shall constitute a quorum for purposes of taking testimony and receiving evidence.

##### RULE 4—PROXIES

(a) Written or telegraphic proxies of Committee members will be received and recorded on any vote taken by the Committee, except at the organization meeting at the beginning of each Congress or for the purpose of creating a quorum.

(b) Proxies will be allowed on any such votes for the purpose or recording a member's position on a question only when the absentee Committee member has been informed of the question and has affirmatively requested that he be recorded.

##### RULE 5—OPEN AND CLOSED MEETINGS

(a) Each meeting for the transaction of business of the Committee shall be open to the public except when the Committee, in open session and with a quorum present, determines by roll call vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public. No such vote shall be required to close a meeting that relates solely to internal budget or personnel matters.

(b) No person other than members of the Committee, and such Congressional staff and other representatives as they may authorize, shall be present in any business session which has been closed to the public.

##### RULE 6—ALTERNATING CHAIRMANSHIP AND VICE CHAIRMAN BY CONGRESSES

(a) The chairmanship and vice chairmanship of the Committee shall alternate between the House and the Senate by Congresses. The senior member of the minority party in the House of Congress opposite of that of the chairman shall be the ranking minority member of the Committee.

(b) In the event the House and Senate are under different party control, the chairman and vice chairman shall represent the majority party in their respective Houses. When the chairman and vice chairman represent different parties, the vice chairman shall also fulfill the responsibilities of the ranking minority member as prescribed by these rules.

##### RULE 7—PARLIAMENTARY QUESTIONS

Questions as to the order of business and the procedures of the Committee shall in the first instance be decided by the chairman, subject always to an appeal to the Committee.

##### RULE 8—HEARINGS: PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENTS AND WITNESSES

(a) The chairman, in the case of hearings to be conducted by the Committee, shall make public announcement of the date, place and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted on any measure or matter at least one week before the commencement of that hearing unless the Committee determines that there is good cause to begin such hearing at an earlier date. In the latter event, the chairman shall make such public announcement at the earliest possible date. The staff director of the Committee shall promptly notify the Daily Digest of the Congressional Record as soon as possible after such public announcement is made.